BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

Order Instituting Rulemaking on the Commission's Proposed Policies and Programs Governing Low-Income Assistance Programs.

Rulemaking 01-08-028 (Filed August 23, 2001)

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE'S RULING ADOPTING IMPLEMENTATION ROADMAP FOR EVALUATION, MEASUREMENT AND VERIFICATION

By Decision (D.) 05-01-055, the Commission directed Energy Division and California Energy Commission staff (collectively referred to as Joint Staff) to jointly prepare an implementation roadmap for evaluation, measurement and verification (EM&V) and Research and Analysis for the 2006 program planning cycle (roadmap) by March 28, 2005 for my consideration.¹ By ruling dated April 4, 2005, I circulated a revised draft of Energy Division's proposal for further comment. I received comments from Pacific Gas and Electric Company, Southern California Edison Company and (jointly) from the Office of Ratepayer Advocates and Natural Resources Defense Council. I have considered these further comments in consultation with Joint Staff, and adopt the EM&V roadmap attached to this ruling (Attachment A).

I note that the Commission is currently considering a draft decision on updated policy rules and threshold EM&V policy decisions that is on the

193503 - 1 -

¹ D.05-01-055, Ordering Paragraph 14.

R.01-08-028 MEG/hl2

April 21, 2005 agenda. Among other things, that decision clarifies the process and timeframe for developing the remaining EM&V submittals that will be required to develop detailed EM&V plans and budgets for the 2006-2008 program cycle. It also provides guidance on what should be contained in those submittals. Therefore, the attached roadmap may need to be further refined and clarified based on the Commission's final decision on those issues.

More generally, per Ordering Paragraph 14 of D.05-01-055, the Commission has recognized that I may need to "provide additional clarification and direction on EM&V and Research and Analysis administrative issues, or make modifications to the roadmap during the program planning cycle." I intend to do so as the planning process proceeds via oral or written communications with Joint Staff, and, as appropriate, by ALJ ruling.

IT IS RULED that the EM&V roadmap attached to this ruling is adopted until further notice.

Dated April 20, 2005, at San Francisco, California.

/s/ MEG GOTTSTEIN by LTC

Meg Gottstein

Administrative Law Judge

ATTACHMENT A

Revised Road Map and Schedule for Evaluation Planning For Proposed 2006-2008 Energy Efficiency Programs To Be Administered by the California Investor Owned Utilities

Developed by the CEC and Energy Division Evaluation Staff Final Revision April 14, 2005

Revised Road Map Evaluation Planning for the 2006-2008 Energy Efficiency Programs Table of Contents

| Report He | ading Pages |
|-------------|--|
| Section 1 E | escription of the Revised Road Map Evaluation |
| | Planning Process3 |
| A | . Introduction and Summary3 |
| В | . Process for Adopting Staff EM&V Protocol and |
| | Project Management Proposals4 |
| C | . Summary of Major Changes Made to the Evaluation |
| | Planning Schedule4 |
| Γ | Phase 1: Transition Planning5 |
| E | . Phase 2: Performance Basis Protocol Development 6 |
| F | Phase 3: Development of Quality Control and |
| | "How to" Protocols7 |
| C | . Phase 4: Evaluation Planning/budgeting for Program |
| | or Market Specific Studies8 |
| F | I. Phase 5: Evaluation Planning- Developing Policy |
| | Oversight and Quality Control EM&V Plans |
| | and Budgets11 |
| I. | Phase 6: Developing a Strategy for Staffing and |
| | Managing Evaluation Studies for 2006-200812 |
| J. | |
| | |
| | |
| Appendix | A: Statewide EM&V Expenditure in Relation to Program Expenditures 1994 - 200314 |
| Appendix | B Proposed Roles for Evaluation & Monitoring and Assessment Activities (Definitions for key terms follow the table.) |

Section 1 Description of the Revised Road Map Evaluation Planning Process

A. Introduction and Summary

In response to comments received from PG&E, SCE, SDG&E, NRDC, ORA, WEM, Hank Ryan, Bill Knox and other EM&V consultants and direction from the Administrative Law Judge, the joint staff EM&V team has developed new schedules for six critical phases of the overall EM&V planning process. Table 1 provides the schedule for each of these phases and final product for each of the phases are listed below.

Table 1
Overview of the Evaluation Planning Process

| | | | | Action |
|----|----------------------------|-----------------------------|-------------------------|---------------------------|
| | | Beginning and | | Required and |
| | EM&V Phase | Ending Dates | Final Product | Expected Date |
| 1. | Transition Planning | May 2 nd to June | Final transition report | No formal |
| | | $20^{ m th}$ | - Agreements on roles | Commission |
| | | | and responsibilities of | action |
| | | | PA's and EMV staff | required. |
| | | | to manage a variety | |
| | | | of EM&V projects | |
| 2. | Performance Basis | May 2nd to July | Adopted Protocols | ALJ Ruling by |
| | Protocols | 15 th | before October final | September 1 |
| | | | program plan filing | |
| 3. | "How to" or | May 15 to | Adopted protocols | ALJ ruling by |
| | Quality control | October 15 th | before RFP's are | December 15 th |
| | Protocols | | released in late fall | |
| 4. | EM&V | April 15 to | Detailed evaluation | Commission |
| | Planning/Budgeting | December 15 th | budget available by | decision before |
| | for Program or | | November 1st for | Jan 1, 2006 |
| | Sector Specific | | Commission action | |
| | studies | | | |
| 5. | EM&V planning for | June 15 th to | Detailed list of | Commission |
| | overarching Policy | December 15 | evaluations and | decision on |

| | | | | Action |
|----|---------------------|---------------------|------------------------|----------------------|
| | | Beginning and | | Required and |
| | EM&V Phase | Ending Dates | Final Product | Expected Date |
| | support and Quality | | budgets available by | budgets by Jan |
| | control projects | | November 1st for | 1, 2006 |
| | | | Commission action | |
| 6. | EM&V Project | May 12 to | Workable plan to | No |
| | Management | January 5, 2006 | select contractors and | commission or |
| | Planning | | manage evaluation | ALJ action |
| | | | contracts in 2006 with | required |
| | | | sufficient staff | |

B. Process for Adopting Staff EM&V Protocol and Project Management Proposals

This schedule assumes that the Commission can rapidly make decisions on proposed protocols and detailed work scope and roles for state and utility EM&V staff in order to support their objectives of approving evaluations plans by October 15th. To support this goal, Staff recommends that the evaluation planning process use an expedited approval process for the protocols described above because of the rapid turnaround time between approval of protocols and the need to develop specific evaluation plans consistent with them. We recommend that the assigned ALJ, in consultation with the Assigned Commissioner's office and Energy Division/CEC staff team, be specifically delegate the authority to approve the transition report, proposed performance basis protocols (consistent with the Commission's guidance in the decision) and the "how to" protocols, after issuing them for comment (via ruling) by all interested parties. The Commission should retain authority to approve, modify or deny the detailed EM&V budget requests to support the proposed evaluation plans that will be consistent with the newly adopted protocols.

C. Summary of Major Changes Made to the Evaluation Planning Schedule

The major changes made in response to comments to our original evaluation schedule are summarized below:

- 1. Moving Phase 4: Planning and budgeting for program specific studies back in time to allow more time for the program planning process to produce final programs
- 2. Moving Phases 2 and 3: Development of New Protocols up in time so that performance basis protocols will be available before the final program plans are filed in October of 2005.
- 3. Adding more time to develop Quality control protocols
- 4. Moving Phase 5: Planning for overarching policy support and quality control projects back to June 15th to November 15th to ensure the contents of all programs are known before making final decisions on scope and research design for WM&V projects.

A more detailed description of what tasks will be accomplished in each phase and specific schedule dates is presented in the last five sections.

D. Phase 1: Transition Planning

The purpose of this phase of the planning process is to gather information on current and ongoing EM&V projects, identify new program strategies or plans that may require new evaluation approaches and clarify project management and support roles for the state EM&V staff and utility portfolio managers. We plan to have meetings with the current EM&V administrators, the utilities, to discuss which types of evaluation projects should continue to be funded in 2006 through 2008 and how they would approach evaluation planning for new program ideas, such as emerging technologies, on bill financing, upstream natural gas programs, etc. In addition we will discuss how to interface the responsibility to verify measure installations with the portfolio administrators plans for program tracking.

In addition we plan to translate the generic guidance from the administrative structure on institutional roles, into a set of assignments for managing specific types of evaluation studies. Based on our review of previous work we will need to discuss how to handle EM&V studies that theoretically should be co-managed because the research questions or topic fall under the responsibility of both state staff and utility program administrators. Appendix B, Proposed Roles for Evaluation, Monitoring and Assessment activities should be the starting point for these discussions.

Our proposed resolution and or agreements with the portfolio administrators of these topics will be presented as a transition report to the presiding ALJ in mid June. We expect her to review the report to ensure its consistent with the ruling but only take action if the report includes recommendations contrary to the decision.

Below we present the key milestones in this process from project start to end in Figure 1.

Transition Planning-Start to end-May 2 to June 20th Utilties should provide ED staff with a status list of ongoing and planned EM&V projects for 2004/5 programs, and opinions on which projects should be continued or followed on by new research 27-Apr Meeting to Discuss data provided above and roles of ED/utility staff and project management by evaluation program type- access to billing data for ED evaluation firms 2-May Meeting to Discuss alternatives to managing numerous program specific evaluation projectsmarket sector focus for mulitple programs? 3-May Meeting to discuss draft integrated EM&V cycle draft from ED/CEC staff 3-May Draft or Final agreement on roles of ED/CEC/PA's and billing data handling for evaluations sent to ALJ 15-May Draft Transition report outlining final evaluation roles for state staff and PA's and proposed process for jointly managing crossover studies and assuring payment of invoices, customer contacts during evaluations, etc Final transition report to CPUC

Figure 1 - Transition Planning Schedule

E. Phase 2: Performance Basis Protocol Development

What data/ parameters (energy savings per unit, load factors, participation levels, incremental costs) must be updated for each program and by when?

The purpose of this phase of evaluation planning is to discuss and decide how the performance basis for each type of 2006-2008 efficiency program will be evaluated, and how often the components of the performance basis for specific program types need to be updated. Parameters of interest include first year savings estimates, program participation levels, useful measure lives, incremental measure costs, program costs, net to gross ratios, technical degradation factors. These updates could either to be used in the calculation of performance basis for current year programs or be used in future program planning estimates of program savings or costs.

After these discussions, the staff team will propose specific "performance basis" protocols to cover these parameters as identified in the recent ALJ ruling on this topic.

Parties will then be given an opportunity to comment on these draft protocols and then the ALJ will issue a ruling adopting or modifying the protocols. The schedule for this process is outlined below in Figure 2.

Performance Basis Protocol Development- What data/ parameters must be updated for each program and by When? Start to end- May 2nd to July 15 Discussion with PA's of Process for updating 2-May performance basis for programs/sectors/portfolios Input to contractor team on draft program classification and frequency protocols Draft Performance Basis Protocols released for 20-May public comment Public Meeting to discuss draft Program Classification and Frequency(for updating 31-Ma performance basis) Protocols by Program type Publish final protocols and ask ALJ to adopt in ruling or commision decision on June 1 program 15-Jur Final Protocols adopted

Figure 2: Performance Basis Protocols

F. Phase 3: Development of Quality Control and "How to" Protocols

The purpose of this phase of the process is to develop protocols that provide guidance and or minimum requirements for the conduct of program level evaluations. These protocols will give guidance on

topic such as appropriate sampling techniques to increase accuracy and reduce bias, methods to estimate load impacts, process evaluations, studies to verify assumptions about baseline energy usage in customer facilities, and studies to estimate or assess market effects from single or multiple programs. These protocols will be relevant to both state EM&V staff managing evaluation projects and for third party implementers or administrators that may opt to perform their own process evaluations.

Figure 3 describe the schedule for developing these protocols below. The goal is to develop the protocols over the summer and have them adopted by November 1, 2005 for use in evaluation studies beginning in January 1, 2006.

Figure 3: Development of Quality Control/How to protocols

| ocol Development- How to Protocols for | _ | | _ | ⊏Va | | | ject | mana | gers | | | | ш | |
|--|---|-------|--------|-----|-------|-----|------|-------|--------|--------|----|---------|-----|-------|
| Start to end dates- 5/16 to 10/15/05 | 1 | April | May | | J | une | | | July | Augu | st | Septemb | oer | Octob |
| ED Contractor will Draft protocols (in rows below) based on the Guidance in the California Evaluation Framework | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Draft of Sampling/ Research Design Protocols | | | 16-May | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Draft of Measurement and Verification | | | 16-May | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Draft of Process Evaluations | | | | | 3-Jun | | | | | | | | | |
| Draft of Impact Evaluations | | | | | 3-Jun | | | | | | | | | |
| Draft of Market Effects Protocols | | | | | 3-Jun | | | | | | | | | |
| Meetings to Discuss Program Reporting Requirements with Portfolio administrators | | | | | | | | 5-Jul | | | | | | |
| Draft of Evaluation Reporting requirements protocol | | | | | | | | | 15-Jul | | | | | |
| Public meeting/workshop to discuss draft protocols from above | | | | | | | | | | 10-Aug | | | | |
| ED/CEC staff Submit final protocols for comment/adoption | | | | | | | | | | | | 10-Sep | | |
| ALJ adoption after comments | П | I | | | | | | | | | | | | 15-C |

G. Phase 4: Evaluation Planning/budgeting for Program or Market Specific Studies

The purpose of this phase is to develop specific plans for evaluations of the programs proposed for 2006-2008. The first priority is to understand the information needs of the portfolio administrators. Specifically what are the key uncertainties underlying the estimates of savings to meet the overall goals: is it program participation, savings per unit, operating hours for specific equipment, etc? The second priority is to gather data to calculate the performance basis for each program or groups of programs in a sector on a triennial basis. The third priority is to discuss the program administrator's plans for

conducting both program tracking and process evaluations for each or selected major programs. This information will guide future ED/CEC plans for verifying installations and tracking program progress in real time.

After achieving an understanding the program administrator plans, joint staff will develop plans for verifying installation of measures and quality control of those installations and include those in its final load impact plans and budget. The actual plans and budgets for these projects will be published on August 10th as part of Phase 5, Developing Policy Oversight and Quality Control EM&V work scope and budgets

At the meetings with the program administrators, we also plan to discuss how the evaluation studies should be phased over the three year life of each program. Options include: Perform three separate evaluations, one each year, for the same program but different topics or plan to hire one contractor for a three year period to gather different types of date for different types of evaluations for the same program.

Finally this phase must also include the development of load impact and or performance basis evaluations for third party programs selected during the competitive process summer of 2005. We plan to begin development of those plans on September 1st (after the winning projects are selected) and issue a draft of these evaluation plans on October 15th. This is followed by a workshop to gather comments and issuance of a final set of plans on November 1, 2005.

The schedule for producing draft study plans and project budgets for these studies is shown in Figure 4.

Figure 4
Program Specific Evaluation Planning

| ation Planning/budgeting for Program and | Marke | et S | Sp | | | tudie | S | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|-------|------|----|----|---|-------|---------|---------|-----------|--------|---|---------|----|-------|--------|-------|----|
| Start to end dates= 4/15/05 to 12/15/05 | | | | Ma | y | | June | July | Αι | ıgust | S | Septemb | er | | | | |
| Utilities (PA's) submit Preliminary list of new | | | П | | П | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| program designs or concepts that will need to | | | П | | П | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| be evaluated in 2006, and or broad program | | | П | | П | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| savings goals | 4/18 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| PA's Submit first round of Program Plans in | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| June | | | Ц | | | 1-Jun | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Meetings with PA's to discuss the priority | | | | | | | June 6- | | | | | | | | | | |
| information needs and/or key uncertainties for | | | П | | П | | june 6- | | | | | | | | | | |
| each program strategy/plan from above | | | Ц | | | | 12th | | | | | | | | | | |
| ED/CEC produces Draft evaluation plans for | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| each major program type by IOU | | | П | | П | | | 15-Jul | | | | | | | | | |
| Public Workshop to gather comments | | Н | Н | _ | Н | | | 26-Jul | | | | | | | | | |
| Public Workshop to gather comments | | | Н | | | | | 26-Jul | | | | | | | | | |
| Meetings to discuss draft plans with PA's | | | Ц | | | | | week of | July 26-3 | 0 | | | | | | | |
| DAIs authorit managed and anomalia to allie a and | | | П | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| PA's submit proposed program tracking and | | | П | | П | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| process evaluation projects and budgets for | | | П | | П | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| their program plans | | | Н | | Н | | | | 15-Aug | | | | | | | | |
| Public workshop togather comments on PA | | | П | | П | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| draft plans | | Ш | Ц | | Ш | | | | | 30-Aug | | | | | | | |
| ED/CEC team submit draft plans and budget | | | П | | П | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| to evaluate third party programs for written | | | П | | П | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| comments by Oct 10 and or get comments at | | | П | | П | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| workshop on 10/12 | | Ш | Ц | | | | | | | | | | | 1-Oct | 12-Oct | | |
| DAIs submit suited and suspense alone but I'm | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| PA's submit revised program plans including | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| third party programs and budgets for process | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| evaluations and market tracking studies | | | Н | | | | | | | | | | | 1-Oct | | | |
| Final Evaluation Plans submitted- PA and | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| EMV team | | | Ц | | | | | | | | | | | | | 1-Nov | |
| Final evaluation plans adopted | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 15 |

H. Phase 5: Evaluation Planning - Developing Policy Oversight and Quality Control EM&V Plans and Budgets

The purpose of this phase of the planning process is to develop specific projects and budgets to support the Commissions policy oversight and quality control objectives. This process will produce budgets that will be merged with the budgets and descriptions of program-specific evaluation projects to produce an overall budget request for EM&V expenditures. Budgets for any planned financial audits, verification of measure installations updates to "statewide" parameter estimates such as measure useful lives or incremental measure costs will also be included. Finally budgets for data collection and analysis projects to support future program planning, including RASS, CEUS and DEER, and the next round of energy efficiency potential studies will be produced in this process.

The start and end of this process was delayed in response to comments from the public. The process is scheduled to start on June 15th and end on December 15th. This extended time period will be necessary in order to review the proposed program plans, identify key uncertainties in the estimated energy savings and performance basis calculated for the final set of program plans approved in the fall and develop studies to help resolve these uncertainties and verify program accomplishments.

The tentative schedule for this process is outlined in Figure 5, Schedule for Developing Policy Oversight and Quality Control Projects.

Figure 5
Schedule for Developing Policy Oversight and Quality Control Projects.

| Start to end dates=6/15 to 12/15 | | | | | | | | | | | П | Т |
|--|--|--|--|------|---|-------|--------|--------|--------|--|---|---|
| ED publishes draft schedule for | | | | | | | | | | | П | Т |
| major policy oversight projects- | | | | | | | | | | | Н | |
| DEER, efficiency potential studies, | | | | | | | | | | | Н | |
| Portfolio or market sector studies, | | | | | | | | | | | Н | |
| RASS, CEUS, appliance sales | | | | | | | | | | | Н | |
| tracking | | | | 6/15 | 5 | | | | | | Ш | |
| ED publishes budget estimates for | | | | | | | | | | | П | Т |
| above studies | | | | | | 7-Jul | | | | | Ш | |
| ED submits draft plan for verification | | | | | | | | | | | Н | |
| of measure installations and quality | | | | | | | | | | | Н | |
| control of installations | | | | | | | 10-Aug | | | | Ш | |
| Public meeting to discuss both | | | | | | | | | | | Н | |
| schedules and budget estimates | | | | | | | | 24-Aug | | | Ш | |
| Revised schedule and budgets | | | | | | | | | | | Н | |
| submitted to ALJ as part of final | | | | | | | | | | | Н | |
| evaluation plan with budgets for | | | | | | | | | | | Н | |
| program specific studies- remit any | | | | | | | | | | | Н | |
| leftover funds to PA's | | | | | | | | | 15-Sep | | Ш | |
| Commission decision on EM&V | | | | | | | | | | | П | |
| study budgets to support policy | | | | | | | | | | | П | |
| oversight and quality control | | | | | | | | | | | П | 1 |

I. Phase 6: Developing a Strategy for Staffing and Managing Evaluation Studies for 2006-2008

The purpose of this final phase is to secure the staff or contract resources necessary to manage all the EM&V projects discussed above. The management from the Energy Commission and the California Public Utility Commission will meet to review their options over the next three months as defined in the schedule below.

Figure 6
Process to Develop a Strategy to Staff and Manage the EM&V functions

| Start to end: May 12 to January 5, | Ш | | | | | | | | | | | | | Н | |
|--|---|-------|--------|--------|--|--------|-------|--|-----------|-----|------|----|---------|------|------|
| 2006 | Ш | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Discussion of Process to Select Evaluation contractors and acquire more contract management staff at the agency level | | 12-Ma | , | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Meeting to consider alternative approaches to staff the contract management tasks,Possible drafting of an MOU between CEC and CPUC | | | 20-May | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Meeting (s) to review tentative list of EMV projects and proposed contracting process | | | | 17-Jun | | 15-Jul | ##### | | | | | | | | |
| Release RFP's on a phased basis | | | | | | | | | sep 15 to | Oct | t 15 | | | | |
| Release RFP's on a phased basis | | | | | | | | | | | | 1/ | 15/06-: | 3/15 | 5/06 |

J. Summary

We appreciate the time that all of the stakeholders have spent to review the proposed schedule and provide comments. State Staff has attempted to respond to all of the constructive comments received on its draft road map by issuing a revised schedule. All of the dates proposed above should be considered tentative until confirmed by the Administrative Law Judge or the assigned Commissioner in a ruling.

Appendix A
Statewide EM&V Expenditure in Relation to Program Expenditures
1994 - 2003

| EM&V expenditures * 34,853 31,941 31,176 21,743 23,334 28,208 27,6 Total EE program funding 202,370 226,276 246,972 163,878 171,636 144,946 190,5 EMV/total EE spending (%) 17.2% 14.1% 12.6% 13.3% 13.6% 19.5% 14. EMV/grand total EMV/grand total 14.1% 12.6% 13.3% 13.6% 19.5% 14. | | | Evaluation, N | leasuremer | t and Verifi | cation (EMV |) funding/ to | tal program |
|---|------------------|-------------|---------------|------------|--------------|----------------|---------------|-------------|
| EM&V expenditures * 34,853 31,941 31,176 21,743 23,334 28,208 27,6 Total EE program funding 202,370 226,276 246,972 163,878 171,636 144,946 190,5 EMV/total EE spending (%) 17.2% 14.1% 12.6% 13.3% 13.6% 19.5% 14. EMV/grand total | | | | | | | | |
| expenditures * 34,853 31,941 31,176 21,743 23,334 28,208 27,6 Total EE program funding 202,370 226,276 246,972 163,878 171,636 144,946 190,5 EMV/total EE spending (%) 17.2% 14.1% 12.6% 13.3% 13.6% 19.5% 14. EMV/grand total EMV/grand total 14.1% 12.6% 13.3% 13.6% 19.5% 14. | | 1992 | 1993 | 1994 | 1995 | 1996 | 1997 | 1998 |
| Total EE | EM&V | | | | | | | |
| program funding 202,370 226,276 246,972 163,878 171,636 144,946 190,5 EMV/total EE spending (%) 17.2% 14.1% 12.6% 13.3% 13.6% 19.5% 14. EMV/grand total 14.1% 14. | expenditures * | 34,853 | 31,941 | 31,176 | 21,743 | 23,334 | 28,208 | 27,602 |
| funding 202,370 226,276 246,972 163,878 171,636 144,946 190,5 EMV/total EE spending (%) 17.2% 14.1% 12.6% 13.3% 13.6% 19.5% 14. EMV/grand total 14.1% | Total EE | | | | | | | |
| EMV/total EE spending (%) 17.2% 14.1% 12.6% 13.3% 13.6% 19.5% 14. EMV/grand total | program | | | | | | | |
| spending (%) 17.2% 14.1% 12.6% 13.3% 13.6% 19.5% 14. EMV/grand total 14.1% | funding | 202,370 | 226,276 | 246,972 | 163,878 | 171,636 | 144,946 | 190,528 |
| EMV/grand total | EMV/total EE | | | | | | | |
| | | 17.2% | 14.1% | 12.6% | 13.3% | 13.6% | 19.5% | 14.5% |
| (%) 11.2% 9.8% 9.1% 9.3% 10.8% 14.7% 11. | EMV/grand total | | | | | | | |
| | (%) | 11.2% | 9.8% | 9.1% | 9.3% | 10.8% | 14.7% | 11.8% |
| | | | | | | | | |
| Above figures include expenditures from PG&E, SCE and SDG&E for electricity efficiency program | Above figures in | clude expen | ditures from | PG&E, SCE | and SDG& | E for electric | ity efficienc | y programs |

Appendix B Proposed Roles for Evaluation & Monitoring and Assessment Activities (Definitions for key terms follow the table.)

| State (CPUC or CEC) | Portfolio Managers | Program Implementers |
|---|---|--|
| Audits of Portfolio Administrators or Program Managers – Financial and Managerial | Audits of Program Implementers expenses and or achievements | Process Evaluation |
| Site visits to verify measure installations Program Impact Evaluation – | Quality Control Inspections/Site Visits | Media Tracking - How many customers aware of message? Customer satisfaction |
| energy and peak | Process Evaluations | surveys? |
| Portfolio Evaluation * Measurement of Baseline conditions - base efficiency levels, operating hours, etc | Market Assessment* - assess impacts of multiple programs or market structure and rules | |
| Verification of Compliance with Protocols | Portfolio Evaluation* - Mix studies- see below. | |
| Market Assessment* savings potential and or goal attainment | Market Tracking of equipment efficiency sales* | |
| Overarching Studies to Support Commission Policy Goals | | |
| Energy Savings Potential Studies *2 | Effectiveness of Training/Audits/Media in reaching customers | |
| Retention or Persistence studies | Best Practices for Programs | |
| Develop and Maintain EM&V Protocols | Improvements in Protocols?? | |
| Maintain DEER database and regularly update | Portfolio evaluation-What portion of portfolio funds should be devoted to training, media, rebates, or web push to maximize portfolio value or energy savings | |

_

² Studies that could be co-managed by both State and Portfolio administrator staff or have one party be lead but the other involved in drafting of scope of work and review of deliverables.

| State (CPUC or CEC) | Portfolio Managers | Program Implementers |
|--|--------------------|----------------------|
| Global Assessments of Net to Gross Ratios for program groups | | |
| Market Assessment*- To what extent are the savings produced by a portfolio of programs likely to be sustainable or permanent | | |
| Other Projects as Necessary to Support the Commission's Efforts to Enhance the Quality of the Portfolio, or the Underlying Data (e.g., EEGA) | | |

Definitions:

Evaluation – Evaluations have two major goals

- (1) supporting improvements in the design of market interventions (e.g. programs) to make them more effective and
- (2) assessing the impacts of current market interventions on a variety of indicators of interest (on adoptions of measures, changes annual and peak energy use, market actor behavior, market structure, etc) Below we identify specific types of evaluations:
 - a. **Program Impact Evaluation** Estimates of the NET change in annual energy and peak period use resulting from a program or group of programs designed to promote the efficient use of energy in a particular customer segment.
 - b. Portfolio Evaluation Review and assessment of the sum of all program load impacts (energy and non energy) on overall energy use at the sector or service territory level and comparison of these impacts to previously defined goals and objectives set for the entire portfolio of programs

Process Evaluation – Review and assessment of a program, or group of programs, used to improve the design and efficacy of the examined program(s) both while the program is operating and when similar future programs are designed.

Measurement – Refers to the use of customer or onsite surveys, data loggers and other recording devices to determine actual operating conditions at a specific set of facilities participating in programs. Includes hours of operation, capacities, energy use for specific equipment and operating conditions for buildings or facilities participating in energy efficiency programs.

Verification – Substantiation that the measures promoted by an efficiency program were installed properly and have the potential to save the amount of energy claimed. More specifically, confirming that the baseline conditions were accurately defined and the proper equipment/systems were installed, were performing to specification, and had the potential to generate the predicted savings.

Overarching Studies – Studies that examine the effect of a large grouping of program on a feature or characteristic of interest, such as the ability of program to reach a particular market segment or effect changes in particular market or distribution or sales channels.

Market Assessment – Assessment of the effect of programs on specific features of a market; including but not limited to stocking patterns, sales levels, attitudes and behaviors of market actors and or customers with respect to specific products.

(END OF ATTACHMENT A)

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I certify that I have this day served the attached Administrative Law Judge's Ruling Adopting Implementation Roadmap for Evaluation, Measurement and Verification on all parties of record in this proceeding or their attorneys of record by electronic mail to those who provided electronic mail addresses, and by U.S. mail to those who did not provide e-mail addresses.

Dated April 20, 2005, at San Francisco, California.

/s/ ELIZABETH LEWIS
Elizabeth Lewis

NOTICE

Parties should notify the Process Office, Public Utilities Commission, 505 Van Ness Avenue, Room 2000, San Francisco, CA 94102, of any change of address to insure that they continue to receive documents. You must indicate the proceeding number on the service list on which your name appears.

The Commission's policy is to schedule hearings (meetings, workshops, etc.) in locations that are accessible to people with disabilities. To verify that a particular location is accessible, call: Calendar Clerk (415) 703-1203.

If specialized accommodations for the disabled are needed, e.g., sign language interpreters, those making the arrangements must call the Public Advisor at (415) 703-2074, TTY 1-866-836-7825 or (415) 703-5282 at least three working days in advance of the event.

Gottstein Attachment A